## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON PORTLAND DIVISION

SHAWN M. NEWCOMB,

Petitioner, No. 3:09-cv-00936-HU

OPINION AND ORDER

**BRIAN BELLEQUE,** 

Respondent.

v.

MOSMAN, J.,

On January 4, 2012, Magistrate Judge Hubel issued his Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") [53] in the above-captioned case recommending that I deny petitioner's Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [33]. Petitioner filed Objections [58].

## **BACKGROUND**

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 1 – OPINION AND ORDER

Case 3:09-cv-00936-HU Document 60 Filed 05/15/12 Page 2 of 2

474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003).

While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or

not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any of the

magistrate judge's F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

DISCUSSION

Petitioner's nine objections to Magistrate Judge Hubel's findings are supported by

arguments advanced in his Memorandum in Support of Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas

Corpus [31]. I have reviewed the briefing in this matter and the Exhibits to Answer [20] and find

petitioner's arguments unpersuasive.

**CONCLUSION** 

Upon review, I agree with Judge Hubel's recommendation and I ADOPT the F&R [53] as

my own opinion. Petitioner's Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [33] is DENIED, and

this proceeding is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 15th day of May, 2012.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman\_

MICHAEL W. MOSMAN

United States District Judge